



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. V. — 1. *Papers from the Society for the Diffusion of Political Knowledge.* New York. 1863.

No. 1. *The Constitution.* Addresses of PROFESSOR MORSE, MR. GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS, and MR. S. J. TILDEN, at the Organization.

No. 4. *The Letter of a Republican,* EDWARD N. CROSBY, Esq., of Poughkeepsie, to PROFESSOR S. F. B. MORSE, Feb. 25, 1863, and PROFESSOR MORSE'S Reply, March 2, 1863.

No. 8. *Bible View of Slavery.* [A Letter by JOHN H. HOPKINS, Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont.]

No. 12. *An Argument on the Ethical Position of Slavery in the Social System, and its Relation to the Politics of the Day.* By SAMUEL F. B. MORSE. August, 1863.

2. *Speech of HON. GEORGE W. WOODWARD, delivered at the Great Union Meeting in Independence Square, Philadelphia, December 13th, 1860.* Philadelphia. 1863.

IN a free country, war is a test alike of national character and of individual virtue. Patriotism and love of country are feeble motives, unless their roots strike down into the soil of moral sentiments, and draw nourishment from the everlasting sources of justice and truth. Whatever more than a geographical district the name of a country represents, is the measure of patriotism and the bond of nationality. When, therefore, a nation goes to war from motives of selfishness, bad passion, or ambition, it weakens its claim upon the individuals composing it for service or honor. It lowers the tone of patriotism, it diminishes its own essential power. But when a nation goes to war from a high motive, in defence of the right, in maintenance of a just cause, then it establishes a new claim on the reverence of its children, and has a right to expect from them the heartiest devotion, and the most persistent support. Then it is that the motives which influence individuals are tested and disclosed, and that their intellectual conceptions of patriotic duty, no less than the manner of their performance of it, are exhibited. Thus war develops the immoral, no less than the moral, elements in a society, and the worth of that society depends on the relative power which

each of these elements secures to itself in the control and conduct of public affairs. The soldier who gives, not only his life, but his heart to his country; the contractor who cheats the government and abuses the soldiers with his shoddy; the chaplain shot in the front of the fight as he leans to comfort the dying; the bishop supporting the enemies of his native land, and wresting Scripture to the defence of slavery; the politician forgetting party, and remembering only the claims of his country and its government; the partisan Governor hampering the Administration in whose hands alone rests the power by which the nation's cause can be maintained, and calling rioters, murderers, and burners of orphan asylums his "friends," even while they stand in arms to violate all law and civil order, — such are among the contrasts which the test of war displays.

And if, in time of war, a government pursue a policy, in part at least conformed to pure justice, while not less conformed to the political traditions of the nation and to the political doctrines embodied in its fundamental charter, then it is that men who, from perversity of nature, from bad education or evil association, from disappointed ambition, or from any other cause, take rank among its political opponents, are likely to overstep the bounds which separate legitimate from factious opposition, and, in the heat and passion of their partisan endeavors, are carried on to profess and defend doctrines, not only hostile to the national policy, but contrary to the principles of right upon which that policy is founded. Considerations of morality are neglected, or, still worse, notions absolutely immoral in essence or in tendency are exalted as axioms by which political action ought to be determined. The consciences and the intellects of the men who hold such views become equally debased, and the arguments they put forth in support of their opinions are discreditable alike to their understandings and their hearts.

It would be difficult to find a more striking instance of this immorality in politics, or a clearer exhibition of the fatuity which is likely to accompany it, than is afforded by the pamphlets of which the titles stand at the head of this article.

The New York Society for the Diffusion of (so-called) Politi-

cal Knowledge is composed, so far, at least, as may be judged from the list of its officers and from the names of some of its prominent members, of a set of men of respectable position in society, some of whom possess fair talents and moderate reputation. The President of the Society, Professor Morse, is the only man of real distinction among them, and his fame rests altogether on his artistic and scientific achievements. It would have been well for his own honor, and that of his country, had he never entered the field of political discussion. But there is one characteristic about the Society which throws light upon the spirit of its members, and the purposes for which they joined together. It is a medley of men hitherto of very different principles and of opposite parties; men who have had little political sympathy, and who now have not much in common but a spirit of bitter opposition to the Administration, a conceit of superior political wisdom, and the gall of disappointed political aspirations.

The Society was formed at a period when the Administration needed the support of all patriotic citizens, and when the people required to be united in hearty maintenance of the measures adopted for the success of the national cause. We were in the very strain and tug of war, — war which could be waged to a successful issue only through the authorities in power. The proclamation of Emancipation had been issued but six weeks before. The policy inaugurated by it was plainly the only policy that could then be followed, unless a revolution should drive Mr. Lincoln from power, and unseat the Congress at Washington. The adoption of this policy was no longer an open question. The cause of the rebellion, the long cause of our internal weakness, had been struck at; the cause of liberty and human rights had been advanced; the policy of America in regard to slavery had at length been made to conform in great measure to the principles upon which her institutions professedly rested; and these men were found ready to take that moment for declaring their bitter opposition to the government, and their hatred of liberty, — ready to take that moment for endeavoring to weaken the confidence of the people in the Administration that had just then such supreme claim to their confidence, and finally to divert the efforts of the people from

the vigorous prosecution of the war by which alone peace, union, and liberty could be secured.

Then it was that these men came together for purposes the real meaning of which is not expressed in the direct terms, and is not concealed by the fine professions, of the second article of the Constitution of the Society.

"The objects of the Society," says that article, "shall be to disseminate a knowledge of the principles of American constitutional liberty; to inculcate correct views of the Constitution of the United States, of the powers and rights of the Federal Government, and of the powers and rights reserved to the States and the people; and generally to promote a sound political education of the public mind; to the end that usurpations may be prevented, that arbitrary and unconstitutional measures may be checked, that the Constitution may be preserved, that the Union may be restored, and that the blessings of free institutions and public order may be kept by ourselves, and be transmitted to our posterity."

Each clause of the foregoing article is a covert charge against the existing government. And the plain object of those who wrote and adopted it was the weakening of the power of Mr. Lincoln's administration. At the meeting, on the 13th of February, at which the constitution, of which this article forms a part, was adopted, Professor Morse, the President of the Society, made a speech. It was a curious performance. "Fanaticism," he declared, "rules the hour." Venturing on prophecy, he asserted, with an amusing defiance of reason and disregard of the logic of speech: "History, ever repeating itself, as time completes its cycles, has not yet closed its sad volume of disastrous hallucinations. It is preparing its pages and reddening its pen to record the story of the foulest tragedy of earth, — the most frightful that is *yet* to deform the annals of the past. Can patriotic men, persuaded of such an issue, be silent, be idle?" "It is our own purpose," he goes on to say, "if possible, to exorcise that reckless, unprincipled spirit which is so rife in the ranks of fanaticism." "The heresies of the state can be and must be reached in a constitutional way by the intellects of the country."

President Morse, one of "the intellects of the country," seems to have been uncommonly successful in reaching the

heresies of the state. In this very speech he reached the heresy of State Rights, and sneered at "the Declaration of Independence, with its mixture of truths, qualified truths, and fallacious maxims."

It is not surprising that, after such an opening, the Society having fairly started on its career of enlightenment of the public mind in regard to political duties, and in its attempt to exorcise the reckless spirit of fanaticism, one of its earliest publications was a letter of Professor Morse, in which he declares, with a pleasing mixture of metaphor, that "on Bible truth, therefore, I am ready to plant every position I take," and then proceeds to rave against the government, the Abolitionists, and the Republicans with harmless zeal, to attack the policy of emancipation, and to defend slavery by supporting Mr. Stephens's famous *corner-stone* doctrine. We must give some extracts from this remarkable performance, to show the character of the language used and of the thought expressed by the President of this Society. Here is his description of Abolitionists, in which the peculiar felicities of his rhetoric and grammar, and the not less peculiar felicities of his moral condition, are charmingly displayed.

"Look at that dark conclave of conspirators, freedom-shriekers, Bible-spurners, fierce, implacable, headstrong, denunciatory Constitution-and-Union-haters, noisy, factious, breathing forth threatenings and slaughter against all who venture a difference of opinion from them; murderous, passionate advocates of imprisonments and hangings, blood-thirsty, and, if there is any other epithet of atrocity found in the vocabulary of wickedness, do they not every one fitly designate some phase of radical abolitionism?" — *Letter to a Republican*, p. 6.

Such language might appear to be that of a fanatic, were not President Morse engaged in putting down fanaticism. And it is not to be wondered at that, having such uncommon epithets to apply to men whose main fault in his eyes is their zeal against slavery, he should himself be found vehemently upholding and defending that "sum of all villanies." But it should be remembered that he speaks as the authorized expounder of the views of a society supported by prominent individuals in the so-called Democratic party, that his words are thus invested with a factitious force, and that they have

been industriously circulated throughout the Northern and Border States. The following passage is a characteristic specimen of intellectual demoralization : —

“ Who has constituted the two races physically different? There can be but one answer, it is God. To attempt, therefore, a removal of this corner-stone, which Infinite Wisdom has laid in the fabric of human society, is of so presumptuous a character, that few should be rash enough to undertake it. The *physical inequality of the races*, then, is this corner-stone, and not slavery. Slavery, which is a *government*, must be, in some form, the necessary resultant of this fact; and if you can remove the corner-stone, — to wit, the *physical inequality of the races*, — you may thus destroy slavery; but, since the ‘Ethiopian cannot change his skin,’ nor can any earthly power do it for him, so long as the two races exist together in the same community, you may change the master, or the relative position of the races, but one or the other will still be dominant. Slavery in America can only be abolished by *separating the races*. Is it worth while to attempt to remove a corner-stone which God has laid ?

“ Slavery is not the cause of the sectional war, but a blind and mad resistance to a physical condition which God has ordained, and which man is in vain attempting to subvert.” — p. 8.

On this logic comment is needless.

But worse publications than this Letter were to follow. Having adopted such principles, the Society must go all lengths; the public must be taught that slavery was the sum of all blessings; the reckless spirit of fanatical humanity, of rash Christianity, must be checked at all hazards; the new creed of political pro-slavery salvation must be preached, and a bishop was called in to head the new crusade against the antislavery infidels. No. 8 of the Papers from the Society for the Diffusion of Political Knowledge is entitled “Bible View of Slavery.” It is signed “John H. Hopkins, Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont.” This tract was written in 1861, as a letter to certain gentlemen in New York. It was originally published at that time; but its fitness for the purposes of the Diffusion Society was so great, that now, two years later, it was adopted for republication and wide distribution. It is an attempt to justify slavery as sanctioned by the word of God, and as, consequently, an institution that must be es-

teemed divinely ordained for the government of a large part of the human race. It is not our purpose to attack the argument by which these conclusions are reached, otherwise than by exhibiting a portion of it in the Bishop's own words. There are some truths which may be regarded as established. It is not necessary to enter upon their defence. If a bishop declares that the Bible sanctions slavery, it is so much the worse for the bishop, not for the Bible. The Bible is, indeed, often greatly misused ; its claims to authority are strangely misunderstood, its real authority abused ;— but that Christianity should be invoked as a defence and protection of persecution, of tyranny, or of slavery, is simply evidence that those thus invoking it have never understood what it is, and have never conceived the meaning of that new commandment by which its founder declared that all men should know his disciples.

There is a striking passage in Mill's essay on Liberty, in which those men are described whose "creed remains, as it were, outside the mind, encrusting and petrifying it against all other influences addressed to the higher parts of our nature ; manifesting its power by not suffering any fresh and living conviction to get in, but itself doing nothing for the mind or heart, except standing sentinel over them to keep them vacant." To this class the author of the "Bible View of Slavery" belongs. The patronage of a bad cause is not necessarily a proof of a corrupt heart, but it is certainly evidence of a feeble or a confused intellect. "The kingdom of heaven," said John Foster, "is no more a place for fools than it is for villains." The force of Bishop Hopkins's intellect may be measured by that of his argument against the Bible and in favor of slavery. It will not be matter of doubt to any one who will take the trouble to read the following extracts.

Here is his account of the ordaining of the black race to slavery,—the stale argument becomes humorous in his hands.

"The first appearance of slavery in the Bible is the wonderful prediction of the patriarch Noah : 'Cursed be Canaan, a *servant of servants* shall he be to his brethren. Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan *shall be his servant*. God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan *shall be his servant*.' (Gen. ix. 25.)

“The heartless irreverence which Ham, the father of Canaan, displayed toward his eminent parent, whose piety had just saved him from the deluge, presented the immediate *occasion* for this remarkable prophecy; but the actual *fulfilment* was reserved for his posterity, after they had lost the knowledge of God, and become utterly polluted by the abominations of heathen idolatry. The Almighty, foreseeing this total degradation of the race, ordained them to servitude or slavery under the descendants of Shem and Japhet, doubtless because *he judged it to be their fittest condition*. And all history proves how accurately the prediction has been accomplished, even to the present day.” — p. 2.

But is the learned Bishop right in thus assuming that “the first appearance of slavery in the Bible is the wonderful prediction of the patriarch Noah”? In De Bow’s Review, for August, 1860, — a review well known as the organ of the extreme Southern principles and opinions, — there is an article in which the author, Dr. Cartwright of New Orleans, maintains that the creature which beguiled Eve was not a serpent, nor an orang-outang, as Dr. Adam Clarke was led to believe, but a negro, the black gardener of the Garden of Eden. If this were so, ought we not, with this writer, to regard the curse pronounced upon the serpent as unquestionably the first appearance and original establishment of slavery?

The plan of Bishop Hopkins’s argument from the Old Testament is to show that slavery existed among the Jews, was regulated by their laws, and then to assume that consequently “the institution of slavery” (we use his own words) “was laid down by the Lord God of Israel for his chosen people.” Coming to the New Testament, he publishes the fact that the Redeemer did not allude to slavery at all, and that he came to fulfil the old law, — that law which the Bishop would assert, in St. Paul’s phrase, but with a strictly literal sense, to be the law of bondage.

Then he continues with the following passage, in which logic is not more violated than humane and natural feeling: —

“It is said by some, however, that the great principle of the Gospel, love to God and love to man, necessarily involved the condemnation of slavery. Yet how should it have any such result, when we remember that this was no new principle, but, on the contrary, was laid down

by the Deity to his own chosen people, and was quoted from the Old Testament by the Saviour himself? And why should slavery be thought inconsistent with it? In the relation of master and slave, we are assured by our Southern brethren that there is incomparably more mutual love than can ever be found between the employer and the hireling. And I can readily believe it, for the very reason that it is a relation for life, and the parties, when rightly disposed, must therefore feel a far stronger and deeper interest in each other.”—p. 4.

Continuing his argument from the New Testament for a page or two, the Bishop brings it to a close with the following words:—

“The evidence of the New Testament is thus complete, plainly proving that the institution of slavery was not abolished by the Gospel. Compare now the course of the ultra Abolitionist with that of Christ and his inspired Apostle. The Divine Redeemer openly rebukes the sanctimonious Pharisees, ‘who made void the law of God by their traditions.’ . . .

“Yet he lived in the midst of slavery, maintained over the old heathen races, in accordance with the Mosaic law, and uttered not one word against it! What proof can be stronger than this, that he did not regard it as a sin or a moral evil? And what contrast can be more manifest than this example of Christ on the one hand, and the loud and bitter denunciations of our antislavery preachers and politicians, *calling themselves Christians*, on the other? For they not only set themselves against the Word of God in this matter, condemning slavery as the ‘monster sin,’ the ‘sum of all villainies,’ but, strange to say, they do it in the very name of that Saviour whose whole line of conduct was the very opposite of their own!”—p. 5.

The Bishop has read the rebuke of those “who make void the law of God by their traditions”; has he not also read the denunciation of those who “pay tithe of mint, anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law,—judgment, mercy, and faith”?

Having proved to his satisfaction the Divine nature of slavery, from the evidence afforded by Scripture, Dr. Hopkins passes on “to notice the various objections which have been raised in the popular mind to the institution of Southern slavery.” The cause which requires elaborate sophistry, which needs suppression and distortion of the truth in its defence, is a cause that can win no favor among honest men. It would

be difficult to find a passage of any writer, claiming respect from position, office, and opportunities, more confused in thought and fuller of fallacy than the following, in which the Bishop discourses of the Declaration of Independence and the equality of men.

“First on this list [of objections to Southern slavery] stand the propositions of the far-famed Declaration of Independence, ‘that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.’ These statements are here called ‘self-evident truths.’ But, with due respect to the celebrated names which are appended to this document, I have never been able to comprehend that they are ‘truths’ at all. In what respect are men ‘created equal,’ when every thoughtful person must be sensible that they are brought into the world with all imaginable difference in body, in mind, and in every characteristic of their social position? Notwithstanding mankind have all descended from one common parent, yet we see them divided into distinct races, so strongly marked that infidel philosophers insist on the impossibility of their having the same ancestry. Where is the equality in *body* between the child born with the hereditary taint of scrofula or consumption, and the infant filled with health and vigor? Where is the equality in *mind* between one who is endowed with talent and genius, and another whose intellect borders on idiocy? Where is the equality in *social position* between the son of the Esquimaux or Hottentot and the heir of the American statesman or British peer?

“Neither am I able to admit that all men are endowed with the *unalienable* right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, because it is manifest that, since ‘sin entered into the world, and death by sin,’ they are all *alienated*, forfeited, and lost, through the consequences of transgression. Life is *alienated*, not only by the sentence of the law, but by innumerable forms of violence and accident. Liberty is *alienated*, not only by imprisonment, but by the irresistible restraints of social bondage to the will, the temper, the prejudices, the customs, or the interests of others; so that there is hardly an individual to be found, even in the most favored community, who has really the liberty of word and action so confidently asserted as the *unalienable* right of all men. And as regards the ‘pursuit of happiness,’ alas! what multitudes *alienate* their right to it beyond recovery, not only in the cells of the penitentiary, but in the reckless indulgence of their appetites and passions, in the disgust arising from ill-chosen conjugal relations, in their associations with the profligate and the vile, in the pain and

suffering of sickness and poverty as the results of vice, in the ruin of the gambler, the delirium of the drunkard, the despair of the suicide, and in every other form of moral contamination !

“ If it be said, however, that the equality and unalienable rights of all men, so strongly asserted by this famous Declaration, are only to be taken in a *political* sense, I am willing to concede that this may be the proper interpretation of its intended meaning, but I cannot see how it removes the difficulty. The statement is, that ‘all men are *created equal*,’ and that ‘the CREATOR has endowed them with these *unalienable rights*.’ Certainly, if the authors of this celebrated document designed to speak only of *political* rights and *political* equality, they should not have thus referred them to the act of creation, because it is perfectly obvious, that, since the beginning of human government, men have been created with all imaginable inequality, under slavery, under despotism, under aristocracy, under limited monarchy, under every imaginable form of political strife and political oppression. In no respect whatever, that I can discover, has the Almighty sent our race into the world with these imaginary rights and this fanciful equality. . . . Where, then, I ask, did the authors of the Declaration of Independence find their warrant for such a statement? It was probably judicious enough to call their propositions ‘self-evident truths,’ because it seems manifest that no man can prove them.” — pp. 7, 8.

That a Christian, that an American, should be found at this day to write in such a manner of a doctrine which lies not only at the foundation of the American system, but is essential in Christianity itself, — the doctrine of the brotherhood of men as the equal children of a common Father, and of their unalienable rights as His children, — is an extraordinary token of the denationalizing and demoralizing effects of subserviency to, and advocacy of, slavery.

“ This brings me,” says Bishop Hopkins, a little further on, “ to the last remarks which I have to present on this famous Declaration. And I respectfully ask my readers to consider them maturely.

“ First, then, it seems manifest, that, when the signers of this document assumed that ‘*all men* were born equal,’ they did not take the negro race into account at all. It is unquestionable that the author, Mr. Jefferson, was a slaveholder at the time, and continued so to his life’s end. It is certain that the great majority of the other signers of the Declaration were slaveholders likewise. No one can be ignorant of the fact, that slavery had been introduced into all the Colonies long before, and con-

tinued to exist long after, in every State save one. Surely, then, it cannot be presumed that these able and sagacious men intended to stultify themselves by declaring that the negro race had rights, which nevertheless they were not ready to give them. And yet it is evident that we must either impute this crying injustice to our Revolutionary patriots, or suppose that the case of the slaves was not contemplated." — p. 10.

Did the Bishop know the history of opinion in regard to this matter, he would know that this "crying injustice" *is* to be imputed to our Revolutionary patriots. And there is not a man in America who does not know that this "crying injustice" has been the bitter source of national discord, and is now being expiated by the blood and tears of the whole people. Mr. Jefferson himself admitted, — and his words on this subject may be regarded as expressing the common sentiment of his ablest contemporaries, — Mr. Jefferson himself admitted the gravity of the contradiction between the announcement of the Declaration of Independence in regard to human rights, and the practice of the men who accepted it as the statement of their political creed.

"What a stupendous, what an incomprehensible machine is man," wrote he to M. Dèmeunier in 1786, "who can endure toil, famine, stripes, imprisonment, and death itself, in vindication of his own liberty, and the next moment be deaf to all those motives whose power supported him through his trial, and inflict on his fellow-men a bondage, one hour of which is fraught with more misery than ages of that which he rose in rebellion to oppose! But we must await with patience the workings of an overruling Providence, and hope that that is preparing the deliverance of these our suffering brethren. When the measure of their tears shall be full, — when their groans shall have involved heaven itself in darkness, — doubtless a God of justice will awaken to their distress, and, by diffusing light and liberality among their oppressors, or, at length, by his exterminating thunder, manifest his attention to the things of this world, and that they are not left to the guidance of a blind fatality." — *Jefferson's Writings*, Vol. IX. p. 279.

In Luther Martin's well-known Address to the Legislature of Maryland, perhaps the ablest remonstrance against the adoption of the Constitution that was made by any of its opponents, there is a noble passage, in which he condenses the arguments that were used against the adoption by the Convention of the

report of a committee "by which the general government was to be prohibited from preventing the importation of slaves for a limited time, and the restrictive clause relative to navigation acts was to be omitted."

"This Report," he says, "was adopted by a majority of the Convention, but not without considerable opposition. It was said that we had just assumed a place among independent nations, in consequence of our opposition to the attempts of Great Britain to enslave us; that this opposition was grounded upon the preservation of those rights to which God and nature had entitled us, not in particular, but in common with the rest of all mankind; that we had appealed to the Supreme Being for his assistance, as the God of freedom, who could not but approve our efforts to preserve the rights which he had thus imparted to his creatures; that now, when we scarcely had risen from our knees, from supplicating his aid and protection in forming our government over a free people, — a government formed pretendedly on the principles of liberty, and for its preservation, — in that government to have a provision, not only putting it out of its power to restrain and prevent the slave-trade, but even encouraging that most infamous traffic by giving the States power and influence in the Union in proportion as they cruelly and wantonly sport with the rights of their fellow-creatures, ought to be considered as a solemn mockery of, and insult to, that God whose protection we had then implored; and could not fail to hold us up in detestation, and render us contemptible to every true friend of liberty in the world. It was said, it ought to be considered that national crimes can only be, and frequently are, punished in this world by national punishments; and that the continuance of the slave-trade, and thus giving it a national sanction and encouragement, ought to be considered as justly exposing us to the displeasure and vengeance of Him who is equally Lord of all, and who views with equal eye the poor African slave and his American master." — *Elliot's Debates*, Vol. I. pp. 373, 374.

From sentiments such as these, expressed with such generous warmth, one turns with a painful shock to the pages of Bishop Hopkins. He closes his attempt to weaken the authority of the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence with a series of extraordinary assertions.

"I have no more to add," he says, "with respect to this most popular dogma of human equality, and shall therefore dismiss it, as fallacious in itself, and only mischievous in its tendency. As it is the stronghold of the ultra Abolitionist, I have devoted a large space to its examination,

and trust that the conclusion is sufficiently plain. Happily, it forms no part of our Constitution or our laws. It never was intended to apply to the question of negro slavery. And it never can be so applied without a total perversion of its historical meaning, and an absolute contrariety to all the facts of humanity, and the clear instruction of the Word of God." — p. 11.

Extraordinary as this passage is, it is surpassed by the next sentences.

"The next objection to the slavery of the Southern States is its presumed *cruelty*, because the refractory slave is punished with corporal correction. But our Northern law allows the same in the case of children and apprentices. Such was the established system in the army and the navy, until very lately. The whipping-post was a fixed institution in England and Massachusetts, and its discipline was administered even to free citizens during the last century. Stripes, not exceeding forty, were appointed to offenders in Israel by Divine authority. The Saviour himself used a scourge of small cords when he drove the money-changers from the temple. Are our modern philanthropists more merciful than Christ, and wiser than the Almighty?" — p. 11.

On this passage no comment is possible, as none is needed. But what is to be thought of a writer who can compare the driving from the temple of those who defiled its courts with the flogging of innocent slaves, the victims of their masters' passions,—who can compare the righteous indignation of the Saviour of men with the murderous barbarities of slavery?

We have not done with the Bishop yet. We must exhibit him still further. The lessons to be drawn from his letter are not exhausted. "You would have all other men slaves," says Milton in answer to Salmasius, "because you find in yourself no generous, ingenuous inclinations; you say nothing, you breathe nothing, but what's mean and servile." Take the following passage as a specimen, not merely of the servile tone of this Bishop, but of the frivolous and quibbling cavils with which he supplies the place of argument:—

"The difference, then, between the power of the Northern parent and the Southern slaveholder is reduced to this, namely, that the master has a *property in the labor of his slave for life*, instead of having it only to the age of twenty-one, because the law regards the negro as being always a child in understanding, requiring a superior mind to

govern and direct him. But, on the other hand, the slave has just as really a *property for life in his master's support and protection*, and this property is secured to him by the same law in sickness and in health, in the helplessness of old age as well as in the days of youthful vigor, including, besides, a comfortable maintenance for his wife and family. Can any rational judgment devise a fairer equivalent?"—p. 13.

"You deserve not the name of man,"—we bring again Milton to witness for us,—“that are so cruel and unjust toward those of your own kind; that endeavor as much as in you lies so to bear down and vilify the whole race of mankind, that were made after the image of God, as to assert and maintain that those cruel and unmerciful taskmasters are provided and appointed by Nature herself, that mild and gentle mother of us all, to be the governors of those whom they enslave. By which pestilent doctrine of yours, having rendered them more fierce and untractable, you not only enable them to make havoc of, and trample under foot, their miserable subjects, but endeavor to arm them for that very purpose with the law of Nature, and the very constitutions of government, than which nothing can be more impious and ridiculous.”

Such was the task undertaken by Bishop Hopkins. Such are the doctrines that he maintains, and that are adopted and sanctioned by the Society for the Diffusion of Political Information. The members of this Society propose—we use their own words—“to promote a sound political education of the public mind.” But in distributing this document they venture out of the field of politics. Party spirit affords no justification for bad logic and worse doctrine. A plea for slavery like this by Bishop Hopkins is not primarily a political tract, but is an attack upon the very foundation of morals. If immoral teachings will promote a sound political education, then this tract may justly be circulated for that end; but not till then.

It is not strange that the same weapons used by the adversaries of liberty and of the government in one part of the country should be used by them in another. The New York Society having found Bishop Hopkins's letter of service to the bad cause, the same letter was eagerly seized upon by the Pennsylvania opposition for use as a campaign document during

the recent canvass in that State. In April last several persons in Philadelphia, bearing names which have been respectable, addressed a note to Bishop Hopkins, stating that they had perused his views on the Scriptural aspect of slavery with much satisfaction and profit. "We believe," said they, with what reads like irony,—"we believe that false teachings on this subject have had a great deal to do with bringing on the unhappy strife between two sections of our common country, and that a lamentable degree of ignorance prevails in regard to it";—and they conclude by asking the Bishop "to favor them with his views on the Scriptural aspect of slavery, and to permit them to make them [his views] public." To this note the Bishop replied, very naturally, that, having seen no reason for changing his opinions, he placed his views as originally published at their service. "I have not found," he says, "in the numerous answers which it [his pamphlet] has drawn forth, any reason for changing my opinion. On the contrary, these answers have only strengthened my conviction as to the sanction which the Scriptures give to the principle of negro slavery, so long as it is administered by the precepts laid down by the Apostles. Such was the universal doctrine of Christian ministers, Christian lawyers, and Christian statesmen, one hundred years ago, with a few exceptions which only prove the rule."

The Bishop's plea for slavery was widely circulated under the auspices of the Democratic State Central Committee in Pennsylvania. It brought scandal not only on himself, but to such degree upon the Christian denomination to which he belonged, that the Bishop and the Episcopal clergy of the Diocese of Pennsylvania united in a Protest, to free themselves from all suspicion of entertaining similar views. They said: "This attempt, not only to apologize for slavery in the abstract, but to advocate it, not only as it exists in the Cotton States, and in States which sell men and women in the open market as their staple product, is, in their judgment, unworthy of any servant of Jesus Christ. As an effort to sustain on Bible principles the States in rebellion against the government in the wicked attempt to establish by force of arms a tyranny under the name of a republic, whose 'corner-stone' shall be the perpetual bondage of the African, it challenges their indignant

reprobation." This remarkable document deserves the more respect and attention from the fact that, in condemning the doctrines of Bishop Hopkins, it, by inference, declared that the men who gave those doctrines the sanction of their names, and who were using them as arguments in a political contest, were blameworthy in no less degree than the Bishop himself. The issue in Pennsylvania was fairly made between slavery and antislavery. Judge Woodward, the Democratic candidate for Governor, planted himself squarely on extreme proslavery ground. Both his own party and the Union party of the State reprinted and distributed a speech delivered at a meeting held in Independence Square, Philadelphia, on the 13th of December, 1860, in which he had indirectly supported the doctrine of secession, apologized for Southern traitors, and had openly defended slavery. He said : —

"And thus it happens that the providence of that good Being who has watched over us from the beginning, and saved us from external foes, has so ordered our internal relations as to make negro slavery an incalculable blessing to us, and to the people of Great Britain. . . . Do you not see and feel how good it was for us to hand over our slaves to our friends of the South, — how good it was for us that they have employed them in raising a staple for our manufacturers, — how wise it was to so adjust the compromises of the Constitution that we could live in union with them and reap the signal advantages to which I have adverted? We consigned them to no heathen thrall, but to Christian men, professing the same faith with us, speaking the same language, reading the Golden Rule in no one-sided and distorted shape, but as it is recorded, — a rule to slaves as well as masters." — pp. 9, 10.

Toward the conclusion of this speech Judge Woodward declared, that

"We must arouse ourselves and reassert the rights of the slaveholder, and add such guaranties to our Constitution as will protect his property from the spoliation of religious bigotry and persecution, or else we must give up our Constitution and Union. *Events are placing the alternative plainly before us, — Constitutional union, and liberty according to American law ; or else, extinction of slave property, negro freedom, dissolution of the Union, and anarchy and confusion.*" — p. 11.

Such doctrines as these sounded strangely under the shadow of Independence Hall, and neither Judge Woodward nor his

ally the Bishop could persuade the people to desert their ancient faith, and to accept the new political proslavery creed. On the 13th of November, 1863, the people declared, by a large majority, that a man professing such doctrines should not be Governor of Pennsylvania.

The Protest of the Pennsylvanian Bishop and clergy had, however, meanwhile drawn out a rejoinder from Bishop Hopkins. In this reply, in the midst of much irrelevant matter, he reaffirms his position, and announces that he shall publish within a few months a full demonstration of the truth wherein he stands. This demonstration will not be of much importance.

We have dwelt thus at length on this disgraceful production, and on this episode in the politics of Pennsylvania, because they afford an illustration of political and moral conditions likely soon to become obsolete. But it will be important hereafter justly to understand them, not only in order to appreciate the disastrous effect upon Northern political sentiment and action of the alliance between the slave interest and the so-called Democratic party, but also in order to comprehend the last aspects of the long contest at the North between the spirit of Liberty and that of Slavery.*

The Society which could circulate Bishop Hopkins's Plea for Slavery to promote sound political education, were ready for any treachery against the principles of our national life. In August last it issued a new defence of slavery, written by its President, Professor Morse. His essay is what he terms an Ethical Disquisition, and its main object is to show, not only that slavery is a social relation divinely ordained, but that to pronounce it a sin is a "sacrilegious dogma," and that to attempt to remove it is sacrilege itself. The literary style and the method of this performance are very suitable to its doctrine. It is, if possible, a more worthless and shallow pro-

* As this article passes through the press, a new illustration appears of the regard in which Bishop Hopkins's services to the proslavery party are held. On the 10th of December the House of Representatives at Washington "proceeded to the election of a Chaplain. Right Rev. Bishop Hopkins, author of the Bible View of Slavery, received fifty-five votes. Rev. W. H. Channing, of the Unitarian Church, received eighty-six votes. Mr. Channing was then declared elected."

duction than Bishop Hopkins's proslavery tract. Here is Professor Morse's view of the social system ordained by God.

"What, then, is the Social System which God has ordained?

"It consists of four distinct, clearly defined, but co-operative relations, thus laid down in the New Testament:

"First. CIVIL GOVERNMENT, in which the relation of *Ruler* and *Ruled* is ordained.

"Second. The MATRIMONIAL; in which the relation of *Husband* and *Wife* is ordained.

"Third. The PARENTAL; in which the relation of *Parent* and *Child* is ordained. And

"Fourth. The SERVILE; in which the relation of *Master* and *Slave* is ordained.

"Now, here we have drawn out by the pen of inspiration a perfect social system, the Divine plan adapted to man as a fallen being, in his disciplinary state; that is to say, to man as he is. Let us examine its structure.

"In these four relations we discover several significant traits. They are seen to be *co-operative*, they each perform an essential part in the discipline of man, and act conjointly, each in its own sphere, to produce the same great result which the mission of the Saviour was intended to produce, to wit, the establishment of *Obedience* in the soul of man. There is a unity of purpose in this arrangement which reveals the mind and hand of the same Divine Author." — p. 8.

"Have those," he continues, "who pronounce slavery to be sin, actually considered the fearful responsibility they incur by the utterance of such a reckless, and, we will say, such a sacrilegious dogma? Will the advocates of this dogma tell us on what principle they endeavor to sustain the validity of civil government, the matrimonial relation, and the parental relation, as ordinances of God, in each of which the essential idea of slavery, *obedience to a superior*, is inherent, and then single out the fourth relation, — the servile relation, — which, by Divine command, is as distinctly and unqualifiedly regulated and made as much a component part of the social system as the others, and not only deny it to be an ordinance of God, but declare it to be sinful?" — p. 8.

"How can we account for this monomania in regard to slavery, which has seized upon so many otherwise sane minds? It must be that most, if not all, of those so fierce in denouncing slavery, are deceived by an imaginary monster, dressed up by their imaginations with every attribute that is hideous and revolting, and which can excite disgust and horror; to them, slavery, tyranny, and oppression are synonymous, and

in their speeches, sermons, and prayers they are convertible terms, and are thus indiscriminately used. They have made a man of straw, and, with all the visionary enthusiasm of a Quixote, are fiercely bent on a valiant encounter with this phantom, the creation of their own heated fancy. Is it possible to reason with men thus exalted? Will they calmly, as well as boldly, look this phantom full in the face? If they will, they cannot but perceive that those traits which have excited their horror, seen through the mist with which a proud infidel philosophy has enveloped them, are altogether *extrinsic and accidental*, it is not the slavery of the Bible, nor of the Southern States, but a creature of their own imagination, clothed in a frightful livery, which has, studiously and persistently for years, been made up for it, from the *abuses* of the system." — p. 9.

Yes! the traits which have excited horror are altogether extrinsic and accidental, are not traits of the slavery of the Southern States! The sales by public auction of men and women, the overworking and whipping and branding of men and women, the breeding of children for profit, the subjection of the slave to the passions of his master, are altogether extrinsic and accidental, are not characteristic of Southern slavery. Mr. Olmsted has made a man of straw. Mrs. Kemble has drawn from her imagination. Jefferson in denouncing slavery was fired with the visionary enthusiasm of a Quixote. General Ullmann saw through a mist of proud, infidel philosophy, when he wrote from New Orleans, June 6, 1863, to Governor Andrew: "Every man [freed negro] presenting himself to be recruited strips to the skin. My surgeons report to me that not one in fifteen is free from marks of severe lashing. More than one half are rejected because of disability from lashing with whips, and the biting of dogs on calves and thighs. It is frightful. Hundreds have welts on their backs as large as one of your largest fingers." But all this is extrinsic and accidental! If facts give the lie to Professor Morse, let him settle it with them. But there is nothing, says Sainte-Beuve, so brutal as a fact.

But it is not enough for Professor Morse to declare the mildness and beauty of Southern slavery. He must show also that it is salutary and benevolent. He says:—

"The servile relation is a *government* adapted to just such a race

[a weak and degraded race]; and God, in his wisdom and far-sighted benevolence, has ordained that despised and vilified *relation* as the means of bringing that race home to himself. This is the Bible theory, and the experience of the day sustains it in both aspects of the question. When the relation of master and slave is left to its natural workings, under the regulations divinely established, and unobstructed by outside fanatic busybodyism, the result, on the enslaved and on society at large, is salutary and benevolent. When resisted, as it is by the Abolitionism of the day, we have only to look around us to see the horrible fruits, in every frightful and disorganizing and bloody shape." — p. 17.

"It is not slavery," he cries, "it is Abolitionism, that is our national sin, and a sin flagrant enough, too, to call down the judgments under which we suffer." (p. 17.) With a logic worthy of the resolutions of a Democratic convention, he declares: "No one who examines, even in the most cursory manner, the aspect of public affairs, but must perceive that it is this *war upon slavery*, and not *slavery*, which is the apple of discord in church and state." (p. 18.)

Alas for the President of the Diffusionists! we fear it is *only* those "who examine affairs in the most cursory manner" who will assent to his conclusion. There is much more of this same sort in this ethical and immoral argument, but we will make but one more quotation from it,—the awful prophecy with which the essay concludes.

"When you see, as you inevitably will, the fruit of your folly, in your war on providential arrangements, and of your obstinate, blind resistance of God's plan for elevating these degraded beings, then will come the bitter memories of the counsels of statesmen and Christians rejected, of warnings despised, 'the name of God and his doctrine blasphemed,' vain regrets for the best blood of the country poured forth like water, and for the millions of treasure worse than wasted in fraternal strife. Awaking from the delusive dream of a hollow freedom, the figment of infidelity, you will find those chains which a false philanthropy had, in imagination, seen fettering the negro, in sad reality fastened upon your own limbs; the boasted liberty and equality which Abolition fanaticism had forced upon the slave turned into disastrous license and hopeless debasement; the country divided, ruined,—the scorn, the sport, and the prey of foreign powers; your own freedom a glittering shadow of the past, and your necks in the dust under the iron heel of military rule. This is the dark programme for a day of fasting and repentance, when

Abolitionism has done its work, and God shall write the doom of the country in letters of blood, for the warning of the world : THIS IS THE NATION THAT PROUDLY DARED TO DEFY MY WISDOM, AND CALL MY ORDINANCES SIN ! ”

Anything that we could add would but weaken the force of this tremendous conclusion. A prophet like Professor Morse cannot be very miserable. There is scarcely a position more flattering to the self-conceit of a weak man, than that of a prophet laughed at by the community, but supported in his self-assumed character by the applause of a small coterie of individuals feeble as himself. He consoles himself for the general neglect by an appeal to the future. If the progress of events contradict his predictions, he is ready with new prophecies of woe. But it is an unsafe thing to invoke the future in support of wrong, and to claim God as on the side of inhumanity.

Already the Society for the Diffusion of Political Information is exanimate, though not extinct, and its pleas for slavery and State rights are ready to be labelled and put away among the curiosities of the past, mere shameful memorials of political and moral error. Its character and brief course remind one of Burke's famous figure of the grasshoppers. “ Because half a dozen grasshoppers under a fern make the field ring with their importunate chink, whilst thousands of great cattle, reposed beneath the shadow of the British oak, chew the cud and are silent, it is not to be imagined that those who make the noise are the only inhabitants of the field ; that, of course, they are many in number ; or that, after all, they are other than the little, shrivelled, meagre, hopping, though loud and troublesome insects of the hour.”

It will very soon be unprofitable for any political party, however unscrupulous, to undertake the patronage of slavery. The current of freedom is setting southward with such force as to sweep away all the puny obstacles with which craft or selfishness may endeavor to stem its course. From the Atlantic to the Mississippi, from Maryland to Missouri and Louisiana, through all the Border States, and through those districts exempted from the application of the proclamation of emancipation, a determination prevails, and is every day gathering new

and irresistible strength, that slavery shall cease. The lessons of the war have not been lost upon those who have experienced its sufferings and sorrows. They see that the Union cannot be restored as long as slavery exists ; that union and freedom are inseparable, and that one is not to be had without the other. And this spirit is not confined to the Border States. As our armies advance, and the former Slave States are gradually once more brought into subjection to the power of the nation, the same spirit will manifest itself among their people. Already the chief obstacle to a speedy and firm reconstruction of the Union is shattered. Liberty is the bond of a new and indissoluble union, the foundation of a true nationality.

For, whatever theories of reconstruction be proposed, whatever perplexities of administration may accompany the new order of things, whatever difficulties may attend the return of the seceded States to the privileges and the peace of the Union, — the great question that underlies all others, and by the solution of which other questions are rendered easy to solve, is already settled. No State comes back with slavery to the Union. The nation, acting by the President, has emancipated the slaves ; liberty has been promised to them, and “the promise, having been made, must be kept.” But more than this, the nation, thinking, speaking, acting for itself, has resolved that henceforth all men within its borders shall be free and equal in the possession of their inalienable rights ; and these rights it will maintain at any cost against those who deny or impugn them.

When peace shall thus be restored, and settled upon that foundation of justice which will render it secure and immutable, the sophistries and the immoralities of the defenders of slavery will sink into the oblivion they deserve. Then we may hope for a nobler code of political morals, for truer conceptions of the nature of the American Constitution, and for heartier and more faithful devotion to the principles from which our institutions derive their worth, their power, and their endurance.